

REMARKS

A brief review of Gottsman, the principal reference, is believed to be in order.

Gottsman teaches a wireless device capable of scanning a bar code symbol from a book or other product and transmitting data corresponding to the symbol to a Web server. The server then queries the Web to retrieve information on the product and displays the retrieved information on the device. The user may then place an order. All of these actions occur in “real time”, that is, they occur at substantially the same time so that the user can readily determine if the price of the scanned product is a “bargain” or not.

By contrast, applicant’s claimed method is involved with processing a “scheduled transaction”. Indeed, the Examiner has acknowledged (page 3, line 4 of the Office Action) that Gottsman does not teach the processing of a scheduled transaction.

As previously argued, applicant’s claimed method requires the server to automatically search a plurality of databases at a reminder date scheduled for some future time from the present time, and to automatically display the search results at said future reminder date. As previously noted, Gottsman does not perform any future searches or display any such search results in the future.

The Examiner acknowledged (page 3, line 17) that Gottsman does not teach the entry of a reminder date or an event date, but concluded that it would have been obvious to modify Gottsman “to include a reminder date and then to use this reminder date within the system to return data to the user (page 3, lines 24-26).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gottsman is concerned with getting a quick price check so that the user will know immediately whether the product price is a bargain or not. It is not

Gottzman's intent to conduct searches at some future time. Gottzman's intent is to conduct a price search in the present. What good is a price search performed days, weeks, or months from now?

The Examiner's modification of Gottzman is directly opposite to Gottzman's intent. Indeed, to modify Gottzman, as the Examiner proposes, would be to destroy its utility. The Examiner's obvious determination is clearly based on impermissible hindsight in view of applicant's invention.

Reconsideration of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KIRSCHSTEIN, OTTINGER, ISRAEL & SCHIFFMILLER, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

489 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10017-6105

Tel: (212) 697-3750

Fax: (212) 949-1690



Alan Israel

Reg. No. 27,564